

REMARKS

The present Amendment amends claims 2 and 28-30, leaves claims 3-26 and 31-35 unchanged, cancels claims 1 and 27 and adds new claims 36-38. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 2-26 and 28-38.

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action the Examiner alleges that Fig. 9 should designated by the legend "Prior Art". Filed on even date herewith are Proposed Drawing Corrections/Replacement Sheets adding the legend "Prior Art" to Fig. 9. Therefore, this objection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 27 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Yamaguchi (U.S. Patent No. 5,798,787); and claims 29-32 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi in view of Lee (U.S. Patent No. 6,507,366). As indicated above, claims 1 and 27 were canceled. Therefore, the above noted rejection of claims 1 and 27 as being anticipated by Yamaguchi under 35 USC §102(b) is rendered moot. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

With respect to the rejection of claims 29-32 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi in view of Lee, this rejection is traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in claims 29-32 are not taught or suggested by Yamaguchi or Lee whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner. It should be noted that since claims 29-32 were amended to depend on claim 27 and such claim was canceled, the rejection of claims 29-32 under 35

USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi in view of Lee is rendered moot and therefore should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's indication in paragraph 10 of the Office Action that claims 2-13 and 28 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of their base claims and any intervening claims. Amendments were made to claims 2-13 and 28 to place them in independent form including all the limitations of their base claims and any intervening claims. Therefore, claims 2-13 and 28 are allowable as indicated by the Examiner. Applicants also acknowledge the Examiner's indication in paragraph 10 of the Office Action that claims 14-26 and 33-35 are allowed.

New claims 36 and 37 were drafted so as to be directed to an object detecting method and apparatus for detecting an object in a predetermined area. According to the present invention, the object detecting method and apparatus images the predetermined monitor area in advance by an imaging device of different visual fields, registers a plurality of the imaged images having the different visual fields, and compares an image from the imaging device with a registered image which corresponds to the image. Based on such, according to the present invention an object detection processing is performed based on a result of the comparison.

The above described features of the present invention are described, for example, in the present application beginning on page 27, line 14 through page 28, line 7 and other locations thereof.

The above described features of the present invention recited in new claims 36 and 37 are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record, particularly Yamaguchi and Lee, whether taken individually or in combination with each other.

Yamaguchi discloses, for example, in col. 5, line 58 through col. 6, line 23 and in col. 6, line 55 through col. 7, line 15 and Figs. 1-3 that a plurality of partial monitoring areas are set in an image 34 that is, for example, one visual field. Yamaguchi teaches detecting image variation for each monitoring area and detecting an image target object based on the sequence of the monitoring regions where an image variation is detected. Thus, in Yamaguchi a plurality of partial areas set in one frame of an image are subjected to object detection.

The above described features of the present invention now more clearly recited in the claims differ substantially from that taught by Yamaguchi. According to the present invention as recited in new claims 36 and 37 a plurality of images of different visual fields are registered in advance and an image corresponding to the visual field of the current input image is selected from among the registered images. A comparison is made between the current input image and the selected image so as to perform object detection. Thus, the present invention is to prepare a plurality of frames of images of different visual fields in advance to make it possible to perform object detection even when the camera image field is changed. Such feature are clearly not taught or suggested by Yamaguchi.

The above described features of the present invention now more clearly recited in the claims as shown above not to be taught or suggested by Yamaguchi are also not taught or suggested Lee. Lee is merely relied upon by the Examiner for

an alleged teaching of a use of a zoom lens control unit connected to bus for changing a zoom ratio of the zoom lens of the image device and a pan and tilt control unit for changing an imaging direction of the imaging device. These features taught by Lee do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to Yamaguchi.

Thus, as is quite clear from the above, the features of the present invention as recited in claims 36 and 37 are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record particularly Yamaguchi and Lee whether taken individually or in combination with each other.

As indicated above, the present Amendment also adds new claim 38. New claim 38 depends from claim 37 and therefore incorporates the above described features of the present invention, as recited in claim 37, shown not to be taught or suggested by any of the references of record whether taken individually or in combination with each other. Therefore, the same arguments presented above with respect to claims 36 and 37 apply as well to new claim 38.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants submit that claims 2-26 and 28-38 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 2-26 and 28-38 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (500.40539X00).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.



Carl I. Brundidge
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc
(703) 684-1120